

CHAPTER TWO

2. REVIEW OF THE LITERATURE REGARDING THE ELEMENTAL AND THE FUNDAMENTAL

Many authors use the concepts "the elemental" and "the fundamental" to such a degree that the words have almost become platitudes in the [German] didactic literature. Some have used only one or the other term, and there are authors who use the one while meaning the other. The concept "element" appears in Greek writings. (In this regard, see Plato's "Republic" and Socrates' *maieutic* [Socratic Method]).* Even in Comenius, "The Great Didactic", the concept elemental appears several times. However, as a **central aspect** of teaching, the problem of the elemental first appeared in Pestalozzi's work (16, 3).

2.1 Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi

As far as is known, there is only one pedagogue for whom a statue has been erected, and this distinction belongs rightly to Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi, the Swiss educator.

Pestalozzi had the idea of elemental forming despite setbacks and rejections by critics, and his own realization of its incompleteness, and his striving for recognition. There must be ways or methods by which contents can be made "graspable", understandable, i.e., accessible to a child, and he verbalized this, among other ways, as "a search for elements, for an elemental method".

If this "art" is acquired once, then its essential and necessary influence will work there ... actualizing countless sleeping human powers, and the effect will be million-fold** in clarifying our present

* Compare Copei's didactics of the fruitful moment.

** Pestalozzi was strongly attuned to things and many of his expressions seem like gross exaggerations. However, this is testimony of his extraordinary animation and enthusiasm for life, but especially for teaching.

state of concealed and obscure insights regarding the essentials of teaching by placing them in a clearer light."***

The above pronouncement already gives us a sense of Pestalozzi: if the method can be found (the elemental method), then first-rate examination results might not be achieved, but "countless sleeping (slumbering) potentialities" will be awakened. This clearly shows that Pestalozzi proposed the idea of a fundamental, situation-surpassing effect of successful teaching, rather than a mere cognitive possession of contents as its result.

The elemental, as a way in which contents can be made accessible, appears, among other places, in Pestalozzi's "eine Anschauungslehre" (An object lesson) which, in a letter to Gessner, he describes as his greatest achievement. However, he also sought "the pure elements on which a human being's physical, intellectual, and moral forming depend."

The elemental method is aimed at allowing human "potential" to develop quicker and on a higher level than by a person's usual, "natural" development.

In his letter about Stans, in which he writes about his problems with teaching and educating Stans' neglected and wildly belligerent beings in (literally!) existential distress, Pestalozzi, for the first time, puts forward his theory of elemental moral forming.

This moral elemental forming has three aspects which must be brought home to children:

- (a) striving for a moral frame of mind by purifying feelings;
- (b) moral practice by self-mastery of what is good and right;
- (c) the cultivation of a moral perspective by reflecting on and comparing correct and moral relationships a child is already in through his/her Dasein (existence) and environment. (17, 23).

The critical reader can construe that this elemental forming is directed to the person, i.e., the subject, with moral reality as the learning contents.

*** "Pestalozzi's Complete Works" were published by Dr. L.W. Seiffarth. This quotation comes from the twelfth volume, page 465.

W. Flitner, who more than any other didactician, has tried to explicate the fundamental, observes that what Pestalozzi describes as an elemental really belongs to the terrain of the fundamental (8, 53). He seeks the fundamental "above all, there where the human spirit becomes, as a **totality**." Viewed in this way, elemental forming can be sought in the terrain of the person (thus, the fundamental).

However, Pestalozzi continually gets his fundamental effect by means of a child making an elemental his/her own. Children must learn things such as attentiveness, obedience, and even joy before they will be "big hearted". One cannot blame Pestalozzi for having a basic stake in achieving a fundamental effect. He takes a position against "preaching rules and orders" to "ennoble" the children. He believes that it is not going to help to preach rules and orders to them; rather, they must arrive at a moral standpoint through authentic acting, experiencing, and lived experiencing (17, 25). If, with his reference to the fundamental, he means that it is what belongs to a person's spiritual life, and cannot be taken as teaching contents, then he can be disagreed with. Contents used for unlocking an elemental can be given any basic direction, also in the direction of moral reality.

In a later workshop, Pestalozzi took up the problem of teaching children of wide-ranging age and talent. This brought the problem of learning material into immediate and pertinent focus (Weniger asserts that "material" is an incorrect term and chooses to speak of learning content) (57, 45). The question which arose is what to teach and how this should be done.

To bridge this problem, Pestalozzi continually sought the "elements"--ways of "elementalizing" learning material, i.e., reducing it to its essentials. He views visual perception, observation as the "general foundation of human knowing, willing, suffering, and doing" (16, 28). Here Pestalozzi differentiates an external observing ("I see the world") from a fundamental observing ("I see myself"). He indicates an elemental-fundamental passage in observing, which runs from "sensory perceptions to clear concepts". Elsewhere, he says a path must run from observing the object to the

object as an "object of my judgment", which is evidence of a search for a child's own taking a position as the learning effect.*

The observing must lift out an essential element from reality and make it visible, thus, make it fathomable. A child acquires insight, understanding, and discernment, but also "sees him/herself", which implies that he/she also acquires self-insight and self-understanding.

The method of observation is even followed today by many didacticists, although not all understand that the observing is more than only an introduction to the world. Pestalozzi chose his objects to be observed, such that a child would see him/herself in his/her perceiving. Thus, it is observing an elemental, which also speaks fundamentally to a child.

For Pestalozzi, the question of the elemental is a question about contents, and the ways the contents must figure forth to be formative. He says directly that all contents are not formative.

It is meaningful when Pestalozzi explains that the element, which must be introduced via visual observation in a concrete case, must be present, but also must be "**general**"—thus, an essential element of a larger whole or more comprehensive structure.

Possibly because he lacked a thorough schooling, Pestalozzi failed in building his theory and practice into what he had wanted them to be. He came across with such contradictory drivel, it is very difficult to explain, in each case, precisely what he means. His attempt to arrive at a "faultless course (perfect sequence)", e.g., is completely contradictory to an elemental method which he so diligently, and with almost religious devotion, preached and put into practice. Such a choice of course by Pestalozzi also would not

* Kritische Ausgabe oor Pestalozzi (Critical Issue on Pestalozzi), published by Buchenau, Spranger and Stettbacher, Part XVI, p. 3 as quoted by Klafki W., *Das paedagogische Problem des Elementaren* ... , p. 28.

"awaken numerous sleeping human potentialities".* (What a striking description of the path to the fundamental!).

Even his reduction of language to sounds (Schall), instead of looking for the elemental in the sentence (as do Schleiermacher and Karl Mager) (16, 76), is a deviation from the elemental method.

Pestalozzi also views the elemental as a means of unfolding contents, and the fundamental, as skill in applying them.

Despite the many points of criticism raised, the contributions of Johann Heinrich Pestalozzi to didactic theory and practice remain almost overpowering. No one who wants to speak authoritatively about teaching, learning, and educating can do so without taking cognizance of Pestalozzi's contributions.

2.2 Friedrich Froebel

Emanating from his romantic-pantheistic life philosophy, Froebel wrote and carried out a teaching theory and an educative practice which was the rounding off his philosophy of life. Many educationists who only know that Froebel was the founder of the kindergarten are not aware that he did not view the children "in the garden", they **are** the garden! His romantic-pantheistic view, however, is also characterized by a deep religious flavor.

Strongly influenced by Pestalozzi, his approach also is that of "observing" as a (teaching/learning) method. For Froebel, this must be **lived experienced** observing, and not merely sensory perceiving.

There must be completed models available for a child's play, but there also must be those models "which are being worked on". With the completed models, a child finds illustrations which are focused on the elemental, i.e., on the system from which they are derived. For Froebel, the fundamental lies in an effect which leads to "intellectual development" after the situation "is comprehended" (16, 102).

* When Friedrich Copei's contributions are discussed later it will seem that any attempt to "improve" a child's learning achievements step by step in a faultless (perfect) sequence will harm him.

Observing, yes, but "active" observing by **doing**, says this great advocate of play, as a form of learning and a method [of teaching]. Observing by doing is the elemental method, a means and end to forming, as well as with being in a situation where a child internalizes outward appearances and externalizes the internal.

Froebel says it is in this way that a child arrives at knowledge and a meaningful existence. He calls this a "life view", and he puts forth, without using the terms, the notion that the elemental is the knowledge gained and the fundamental is what he calls a meaningful existence.

The concepts elemental and fundamental figure in many of his pronouncements, such as the following: an essential task of forming is to arrive at a fundamental, substantial relationship with reality. How does one do this? Through an elemental, or in an elemental way. The means to forming, that phenomenon which brings a child to a substantial relationship with reality, then can only be a means to a "life view" (forming) as it is "purified", i.e., as it appears in elemental form.

Froebel's aim to internalize the external and externalize the internal can be meaningfully clarified in terms of the path from the elemental to the fundamental, as criterion.

To internalize the external means to unlock reality for a child so he/she can make it his/her own. Froebel prefers that this making one's own occurs in terms of play or "involvement with things". Making one's own, however, is not the end of the path for the adult, as one who unlocks reality. The child must "externalize", on the one hand, by stepping out of his/her reservedness as a person, but there also must be actions showing that he/she can now think and act differently than before in his/her "involvement with things". A child doesn't merely learn, but he/she also must know that he/she has learned.

Then, the child gains **formative insight**. In other words, to use Scheler's term, he/she has "Bildungswissen" (formative knowledge), i.e., knowledge and insight! It is an insight within which the specific resides in the general, "where the inner structure of the matter, affair, relationship, the logic of the matter of his becoming and specific nature (essence) are grasped, understood, or comprehended."

Scheler's remark about "formative knowledge", which was brought into relation with Froebel's views by Klafki, is repeated here and discussed, since it makes a definite contribution to the problem of the present study (16, 102).

According to Scheler (16, 102), formative knowledge "is ein an einem oder wenigen guten und prägnanten Exemplaren einer Sache gewonnenes und eingegliedertes Wesenswissen, das zur Form und Regel der Auffassung, zur Kategorie aller zufälligen Tatsachen künftiger Erfahrung des selben Wesens geworden ist." [Since this quotation is discussed in enough detail in the following paragraph, I don't try to translate it G.D.Y.].

What does Scheler's pronouncement include? A few pregnant exemplars of a matter are unlocked for a child (but he doesn't say this) which equip or allow him/her to master formative knowledge, which is an insight into what is essential. So far, one understands that good and pregnant exemplars (thus, good elementals) are chosen, and this formative knowledge (knowledge and insight) is assimilated. This is an ordered insight, which is the basis for an **interpretation** (a first fundamental). This becomes a category for all coincidental facts which are essentially alike, and with which a child is going to deal in his/her future experiences (a second and functionalized fundamental). With this quotation of Scheler's, it seems that a child, as consciousness, also is aware that he/she has learned.

Further, Froebel asserts that a child does not acquire this formative insight by generalizing from many individual cases; it is an insight which is exemplified in the pregnant case. Repetition can strengthen the insight, can make it maneuverable, **but the repetition does not gradually bring it forth!**

The above comments by Froebel have inherent relevance for didactic practice. Especially, they can give didacticians concerned with teaching languages new insights about teaching methods. What he says is this: a child does not learn with insight if he/she repeats over and over. He/she learns with insight if one representative case with transferable possibilities (pregnant case) is unlocked in an elemental way. The repetition comes with practicing the insight, and then the maneuverability of this insightful knowledge arises, not the other way around. Knowledge and insight

acquired in this way, says he, remains even when the specifics are long forgotten. Also, Mursell's* position is that successful teaching must stand the test of time as a child's fundamental attitude or taking a position, rather than as remembering details.

The specific nature of Froebel's notion is reflected in his statement that forming is actualized there where the elemental appears as "aufgehobene Genese" which, as far as it can be translated, means collective genesis or becoming brought about together.

What Froebel presents here has significant didactic meaning: if the learning contents appear as "purified", they are elementals. And the elementals, as origins, are what are compiled for use. Use for what? For genetic teaching--teaching which has becoming [adult] as an effect. For whose use? For use of the one becoming, the child who requests that this "collective becoming" be passed on for meaningful and insightful world meaning and self-understanding. The use of the concepts "genesis" for becoming and "genetic learning" for learning, which are the effects of unlocking with an impact on becoming, appear generally and freely in the German literature. It is in this context that Wagenschein's argument for genetic learning also must be understood (56, 1).

Knowledge and insight acquired, as well as the awareness of them, do not leave a child untouched. He/she is an initiator of relationships and anticipates a structured reality (Kant). Froebel says that a child comes forth to meet reality with "anticipation". This intentionality-directed anticipation, for Froebel is essential for successful unlocking. Observing without anticipating is a blank sheet. Froebel says didactic pedagogics has the task of awakening, practicing and strengthening this "anticipation".

A child is in the world as an anticipating being, but awakened and practiced anticipation is the fruit of successful teaching and, thus, can be nothing more than a didactic category. Certainly, a child also has had affective and cognitive lived experiences in his/her involvement with "observing by doing". Giving meaning also occurs there, but the fundamental, which is excluded by Froebel, is that a child goes forth in anticipation to meet reality with the expectation that, also in his/her future exploration of reality, he/she finds his/her way, and that this makes sense. In the earliest literature, it

* Mursell, J. L., (1954) **Successful teaching**. New York: McGraw-Hill. p 1.

is especially Gehlen and Lahrmann who put forward this line of thought (19, 9).

2.3 Johann Friedrich Herbart

Initially, Herbart was strongly influenced by Pestalozzi, and the ideal of an elemental method resonates even in his later writings. He built the course of his lessons following a theory of association to such completeness that it can be viewed as the first attempt at a grounded lesson structure.

The aim of his search for elemental methods was "to promote a person's dealings with his world" (16, 147). Today, one would say that there must be an unlocking by which a child's dialogue with his/her world is elevated. Herbart is the first to describe simplifying contents as a reduction of the learning material, a concept which later is explicated by Van der Stoep as a didactic category (47, 30).

The elementalized content is viewed by Herbart as the simplest form of learning content which is found by a sustained reduction. He also describes the elemental as "a few characteristic points" of the learning content "which might possibly be confusing". Yet, Herbart qualifies this seeming "confusing" arrangement of the "characteristic points" by saying they arise in surrounding reality. Thus, the elemental must be a characteristic of the learning content and not foreign to it.

Also, Herbart understood that there are varying levels of difficulty, depending on how the reduction is done.

The word fundamental isn't itself used by Herbart, although he insists morality is a necessary learning aim. He seeks the fundamental effect by way of deepening and reflecting. H. Nohl indicates that "numerous trends of reform-pedagogics in our century, after very many disappointments, have discovered that these two concepts have timeless validity for effective teaching" (16, 147). However, what Nohl fails to clarify is the huge gap in Herbart's difficult attempt, i.e., the path from the elemental to the fundamental effect. According to Flitner, a criterion for successful teaching is the connection of the elemental with the fundamental (8, 52), and this is missing in Herbart's didactic system.

Herbart states that a child must continually choose the good and reject the bad. If this is not educating, nothing is, rightly says Herbart. As a pedagogical matter, being moral is described by him as a child who stands under a law which he/she has made his/her own.

With his stages of learning, Herbart seemingly moves only in the terrain of the elemental, i.e., there where the contents are made child ready and passed on to him/her. However, this would be a one-sided view of Herbart's attempts, because he has many descriptions of "interests". He states that human Dasein (existence) is considerably more than a "process of assimilation". A person's active interest must be stimulated and exercised so that it becomes a disposition which remains with him/her through his/her whole life. "The training will pass, whereas interests will persist for one's entire life".

With this, a life relationship is laid down, which can be interpreted as a fundamental, i.e., a lifelong interest in what concerns one. What, in elemental ways (also as learning stages and associations), a child makes his/her own, must have fundamental relevance for him/her as life meanings (as interests).

The gap in Herbart's didactics is in the fact that he has given lots of attention to unlocking reality and, at the same time, has set high ideals for educating (forming), but has not indicated how, from the differentiated, stepwise unlocking of contents, a child acquires the desired life relationships as outcome. For example, a child must continually choose the good. He/she must learn to choose the good and reject the bad. But Herbart fails to indicate which elemental must be unlocked to bring a child to a fundamental disposition such as "rejecting the bad". The gap lies on the path from the elemental to the fundamental, or what Flitner calls the union between the elemental and the fundamental. Herbart's didactic theory and practice are not attuned to the path from unlocking in learning stages to "interest".

Otto Willmann (16, 180) offers a similar objection to Herbart's didactics, i.e., that he had so concentrated on presenting that he had not arrived at contents of knowledge and thinking.

Nohl, however, was not wrong in referring to Herbart as "the living Herbart" (15, 147). Despite gaps in his didactic theory and practice, there is much to learn from Herbart's writings and didactic actions.

It is really Herbart's followers who advocate entirely one-sided didactic activities and make the claim that this is what "Herbartians" should be. In this respect, especially Ziller and Rhein have bequeathed us a misrepresentation which has detracted from Herbart's true place in didactic pedagogics.

2.4 Friedrich Schleiermacher

With the slogan "Search for the elemental", Pestalozzi and his followers had, for the first time in pedagogical (didactic) history, placed the elemental in a central didactic position. They endeavored to find elemental (essential) views and insights by which the world could be unlocked for a child.

Herbart described a person's attunement to the essential as "interest" and, with that, the fundamental was considered. This interest essentially means more than merely interest, as concern. It is interest acquired by insightful mastery, and which includes a being open and standing open to reality.

However, it is to Schleiermacher's merit that he has greatly clarified both concepts with his explication of the concept of the elemental. He starts from didactic reality. Two concepts figure prominently in his explanation, i.e., "Gesinnung" (way of thinking, a disposition to think structurally) and "Fertigkeiten und Kenntnisse" (skills and knowledge) which, for some reason, he summarily calls "Fertigkeiten" (skills). Both concepts refer to a didactic fundamental which figures in two clearly specifiable ways. On the one hand, the unlocking leads to skills and knowledge a child acquires in a teaching (unlocking) situation. This already indicates a change in a child's being-in-the-world. But Schleiermacher also speaks of another fundamental, basic relationship, i.e., a modification in the way a child thinks. Both changed dispositions stem from learning contents which are unlocked in their elemental form, and which a child makes his/her own.

For Schleiermacher, as for Pestalozzi, the method coheres with "the art of finding the 'elements'". This finding "elements" must always precede unlocking the matter for a child. The contents must be explored beforehand so one can determine which "elements" are essentials of the matter. To meaningfully carry out the reduction, one must work backward from the aim to the point of departure from where the unlocking is going to begin. In this way, it can be

teleologically determined which elementals are near to life. The main point of such a reduction, says Schleiermacher, is to not pass over the essential points in the act of reduction. The "elements" must include the life moment of the greater relationship, otherwise they do not qualify as elementals. For him, elementalizing is also an intensification of contents to the elemental.

Schleiermacher qualifies the elemental as a scientific-didactic concept. It requires an act of abstraction to determine elementals. The elemental does not necessarily arise as differentiated contents of reality in the lifeworld. Elementals seldom or ever figure as singly or separately established concepts. They figure as moments of reality in smaller or larger relationships.

With this latter view of the elemental, as moments of reality in relation with other moments, the problem field of differentiation is broached. On the one hand, this protects Schleiermacher from searching for the "elements" of language in words or sounds, as did Pestalozzi, because that does violence to the life moment and the relationship of language. The elemental of language, for Schleiermacher, as for Karl Mager, is the simple meaning and not the individual word or sound. Only in this sense is language meaningful and is a relationship perceptible. Variations in the relationship of the life moments will determine how easy or difficult the concepts will be for the children.

The elemental must not only increase the spiritual permeation of the learning contents, but it must also guarantee it. There either is an elemental passage to the contents for a child or there is not. There is a fruitful moment when a child experiences and lived experiences insight, and when there is a changed meaning of reality recognizable and measurable in terms of the criteria of "ways of thinking" and of "skills and knowledge".

The "element" (always intended with a didactic connotation) which is clarified as the elemental, but clarified at the same time, is the whole of the content of which the elemental is a representative case which has arisen from the ground of the intrinsic structure of the relevant area of reality to which it belongs. Reality is not diffuse, but it has an internal and external structuredness. The elemental, which includes a life- or reality-moment, is not separate from or outside the greater reality it represents. It is a concrete representation of the general (47, 123 et seq.).

Very important for Schleiermacher (and for anyone who wants to think accountably about instructing and teaching), is the fact that the elemental is comprehensible neither by splintering nor as a yardstick or scheme of things. Splintering refers to reducing language to an isolated word, and the relationship is lost with language as it is valid in the lifeworld. A study of parts of speech without context does not make the living language intelligible to a child. In the same way, systematizing or schematizing, which really are thought constructions, cannot make the living reality known to a child with which he/she must establish a relationship.

According to Schleiermacher, a child makes the elemental his/her own by abstracting, but he/she must let the essentials of what is abstracted be disclosed. This embodies a necessary task for didactic epistemology to disclose this making one's own by a child, and pass this on to didactic practice as necessary equipment by which successful unlocking can be launched. Investigating the child, as potentiality for abstracting, requires epistemological research without which didactic practice, to some degree, must "feel" its way.

Schleiermacher proceeds from the standpoint that there are essentially two epistemologies which must be disclosed and described, i.e., one based on parental educating and the other on the activities (teaching) which parental educating places before those for whom it is a life task to teach and educate. "A theory about both seems useful, indeed necessary" (41, 36). For Schleiermacher, parental educating lies more about "a way of thinking (opinions), and the entire character of spirituality in general" (41, 36). With this, he indicates that parental educating is not so much introducing actual reality, but the world of norms and opinions (50, 115). In contrast, for him, the teacher's contribution is in the direction of bringing forward knowledge and skills, i.e., factual knowledge.

This is a defect in his epistemological pronouncements in that he wants to describe two didactic-pedagogical theories and practices, i.e., one for parental educating and one for a formally established school practice, because these really are two facets of the same human activity.

For him, the path from elemental input to fundamental ways of thinking is in the fact that the "fundamental directions and ways of

thinking” arise only in the skills and knowledge and, hence, at the same time, are actualized by them (16, 162). The passage is from the knowledge unlocked to an opinion, as a manner of thinking.

Schleiermacher's great contribution to didactic epistemology and practice is that the success of teaching no longer depends on a purely systematic foundation, but on the fruitfulness of unlocking reality as an activity demanded by life. The above insight is considered further when the contributions of F. Copei are discussed. Spranger also mentions the fruitfulness of the elemental, a direction of thinking which constitutes the foundation of this study.

Finally, Schleiermacher says, in its fruitful transition, the elemental immediately directs a child to the structured reality which he/she must now enter HIMSELF. Forming is essentially self-forming--forming from the inside to the outside. In this respect, his view agrees with that of Kant, who says the development of intellectual gifts occurs from within a subject; in the opposite way (i.e., from outside in) these functions are only haphazardly attainable.

2.5 Otto Frick

According to Frick, all teaching has the task of being elemental, in the highest sense, i.e., to disclose and make understandable the "elements" which are at the foundation of things. This can happen if a child is afforded the opportunity, by means of concrete types, prints, etc. to him/herself discover, disclose, and explore.

A meritorious contribution of Otto Frick to our insight into the elemental and the fundamental is his understanding that the typical course of didactic activity is where reality, as an elemental, is unlocked for a child and becomes his/her own fundamental method for trying to unlock reality. Such a typical attunement by a child constitutes a fundamental way of going out to reality. Thus, a child gains insight in two ways:

- (a) by elemental unlocking;
- (b) by making the method of unlocking his/her own, and to use that method in future dealings with reality.

Another observation by Frick which deserves mention is his insight regarding review and repetition. He does not see the necessity of making room for lots of time for testing and repetition in a year or

semester timetable. Where teaching follows the path of unlocking the elemental and the fundamental, Frick says the fundamental insights of the life area of concern, once again figure and this is equal to review and repetition, perhaps even more effective.

Thus, elementalizing is the typical pedagogic way in which there can be progress to a deepening and foundational content of a matter, and by which the act of formative teaching is actualized.

With this, Frick has broached a matter which so many persons who have to make judgments about teaching and educating are not aware of, i.e., that teaching and educating are actualized in ONE activity. Educating is not possible without teaching, and teaching finds its meaning in educating. The question about teaching and educating is a question about the formative quality of the contents and about how effectively the elemental is unlocked.

The quality of the unlocking of the elemental is manifested in the learning effect, but, as a fundamental, it also influences the intensification of life and the enrichment of a child's existence.

Frick asserts that there is a typical course in this activity leading from a total view to a deepening in particularities, and a rethinking of the whole.

Frick provides a methodological insight regarding the elemental, in so far as he does not have the elemental completely dished out to a child, but sees that a child acquire this (elemental) through cognitive co-activity with the unlocker [teacher].

A didactic line is drawn from Pestalozzi through Herbart to Frick in so far as there is a search for an unlocking of the elemental. Otto Frick refers to the elemental as "viewing representations of the essentials". The elemental also is the typical teaching principle which is a concretization of the general, and which is teleologically determined (by the aim). Strikingly, Frick talks of the reduced contents as formative material. (Compare this with Froebel's collective becoming). The elemental contents have a mediating character, and always reveal the essence of a whole "group" of details (data).

For Frick, there is an evident path from the elemental to the fundamental. Elemental contents which are unlocked for a child

make the larger structure of reality accessible to him/her. The greater train of thought comes to light in what is clarified by the concrete images or prints (16, 186). But, for Frick, a more important aspect of the fruitful result of teaching is in the formative effect of correctly chosen contents. For him, the scope and impact of an unlocking is in its "Bildungsgehalt", in its formative quality. Frick borrows this concept from Otto Willmann. The fruit of the activity of unlocking is not so much in the amount understood and made one's own, but in the quality of the forming which is brought about by the unlocking.

As a great champion of Protestant thought, Frick, in teaching, prepares a path to the fundamental which clearly is a way to Christian anticipation and transcendence [for a believer].

2.6 Otto Willmann

Willmann stresses that contents vary in their formative quality. The fundamental fallout of didactic unlocking is sought by Willmann in what he calls basic or fundamental attitudes. Some contents have the possibility of a clearer path to a basic attitude than others.

In contrast with Herbart and the Herbartians, who would work through a clear representation, Willmann would rather see the result of an effective didactic activity manifested in a basic attitude (taking a position) of the learner (16, 180). He also asks what apperception really is, and what significance it holds for didactic theory and practice. Willmann's entire point of departure shows that he does not give much credence to the theory of apperception in didactics.

The difference in planned learning effects between the Herbartians and Willmann needs further explication because this is of essential significance for the theory of the elemental and the fundamental. In the discussion of Schleiermacher, it is indicated that finding the elemental occurs teleologically by looking back from the aim of the unlocking to the contents and, in doing so, determining what elemental is going to be introduced as reduced or intensified content. It follows that, if one works back from a clear representation, there is the possibility of selecting other significant elementals, as when one explores a field of contents from a basic attitude of the learner. Before any unlocking, a question which always ought to be asked is if the learning aim is a path to a clear

representation, or to a basic attitude, or taking a position. A clear representation is a fundamental. The only question is if this is the only fundamental which the unlocker pushes through to, and whether a change in basic attitude of the learner is not a more desirable fundamental. A clear representation can, in the course of time, fade away, while a changed basic attitude holds the possibility of modified life meanings which can be of a more lasting nature.

A criticism of Willmann's didactic theory building and establishing a practice is that he attributes intrinsic "power" to contents to bring about basic attitudes in the learners. To the naive reader, this can give the impression that a piece of content will have a strong possibility of bringing about a basic attitude in the learner under all circumstances and in all situations. If one should accept this, he/she is at that point where a person is not considered, and the formative quality of the learning contents are decisive. This standpoint can be described as didactic objectivism. Although it certainly is true that some contents lend themselves better to establishing a stronger basic attitude, many other factors must also be considered. For example, there are more and less effective ways of unlocking contents. The contents must be unlocked in terms of an elemental or an elemental input. This is the work of a person and does not merely lead to a basic attitude with equal regularity. This varies with different unlockers of reality, and from child to child.

In addition, one must keep in mind what Scheuerl says about the elemental, i.e., that it always simultaneously exemplifies something for someone (42, 82). All elementals are not equally suited for all learners. Each child is an open possibility. The child, as an affective, cognitive and meaning-giving possibility, co-determines if a weaker or stronger basic attitude takes root. The preconditions of stable, labile, or impulsive lived experiences of these contents, and the unlocking of reality are additional factors co-defining whether the contents are going to have more or less of a formative value.

A systematic course of teaching means something totally different to Willmann than a "complete or uninterrupted succession". For him, it follows the course of the elemental as typical principle. By such a course, gradually dispositions such as basic attitudes are brought home to a child, which are performance categories for future dealings with essentially similar contents. These performance

categories and basic attitudes are descriptively characterized as *fundamentalia*.

2.7 Peter Petersen

As a great advocate of group teaching, Petersen looks mainly for the elemental in elementary group situations as social educating. In addition, for him, the elemental also is in mastering grammar and terminology unique to a subject matter. He says it is necessary that these concepts must be unlocked before the factual contents can appear. "As soon as the elemental-grammatical holds sway, then a child works freely" (16, 233-235).

No unlocker of reality would try to do so in terms of concepts and subject terminology which are not clear to a child. However, when Petersen proposes devoting a year or more mainly to studying subject grammatical insights, then there is fault to find with such a didactic course.

Petersen's entire vision of the elemental is as a methodological problem, and especially regarding a child's equipment before there is real unlocking and a fruitful moment. (By first mastering the terminology).

With Petersen, the fundamental figures on a very limited level as skills and techniques which are mastered and when the learner enters the future. There is no clear indication of an authentic passage from unlocking contents to making them one's own and a situation-transcending fundamental.

2.8 Richard Seyfert

In 1930, Seyfert indicated that the syllabi try to cover too much. He endeavored to limit himself to learning material aimed at offering his pupils the essentials of the subject contents in terms of unlocking the typical. A child must master "elements" which lead to knowledge and insight (see Scheler's formative knowledge). For Seyfert, there is a "unity in multiplicity" which is noticed, and which must lead to its simplest element. This element, as core material, must be the basic practice (unlocking?) which discloses the essence of the learning area of concern. For Seyfert, it is in the typical, reciprocal themes, core material and simplest elements in which the

way lies for learning contents to be raised for discussion for teaching to be effective (16, 250).

Formative contents have a formative quality and value, and Seyfert shows a path from the elemental to the fundamental. The learner first must make the formative contents his/her own and **assimilate** them in their **essentials**; in the second place (and here follows his/her fundamental), he/she must allow them to become externalized to **act as a formed person**.

One unlocking (presenting) about house building, or plant life can give a child the guidance for him/herself to later investigate a bit of a forest, nature, or to build something. Seyfert talks of a child mastering categorical insights.

He gives sound advice to the one who unlocks reality to reflect on the unlockings which were meaningful and essential for his/her own forming. He/she must try to fathom the essentials of the subject and unlock them for a child.

2.9 Josef Derbolav

Derbolav writes about the exemplary as a didactic principle which, in his view, "is still not theoretically and systematically elucidated and made room for in the framework of pedagogics". For the aim of this discussion, we place Derbolav's contributions about the exemplary under the larger theme of the elemental and give an indication of the deep-seated fundamental breakthrough which Derbolav broaches (11, 29).

Derbolav's search for a didactic theory was also compelled by the question of the deluge of learning material. He links up with Wagenschein, but applies himself to teaching history, while Wagenschein works in teaching the natural sciences. He looks for the elemental in the exemplary case and argues that the rare and wonderful are to be found in the ordinary.

The course of teaching should not be built up systematically, but thematically, and the learning contents should not be presented dogmatically but heuristically. That is, a child should not be forced into an insight, but he/she must have an opportunity to make his/her own deductions, and find things out for him/herself. Derbolav views the elemental as a thematic matter instead of merely

as only omitting parts. The choice and heuristic development of the "theme" has a genetic (becoming) foundation and, although history is also going to be "narrated", it need not yet adhere to the chronological aspect of history, but to themes of origins and relevance to living.

For Derbolav, this primarily amounts to digesting the representation of the whole of a subject or area of science in one or more basic themes, and didactically bringing them within a child's grasp. In addition, he offers a remark which touches the whole sense and scope of this activity. He asks the open question of whether it is so unequivocally possible to make learning contents accessible to children, and whether underlying this activity, there are many ways of representing the contents which must be distinguished. Therefore, this study shows that contents can be made accessible to children, and that there are many ways to represent and interpret them, all falling under the comprehensive concept of the elemental (Klafki).

In addition, Derbolav refers to other basic aspects of the elemental, i.e.:

- (a) it gives rise to foresight and basic knowledge;
- (b) it establishes a method of transfer (unlocking) and, last but not least,
- (c) it also further elucidates primordial human motives.

With this last function of the elemental, we are squarely in the fundamental. Science must not only be established in terms of its development, and clarified in terms of its human significance, but it also must make the fundamental phenomena of our modern existence understandable.

From this, it is seen how Derbolav aims for an authentic path from science to a person's becoming and taking his/her own position, i.e., an unlocking in terms of reduced contents.

Considering the propaedeutic nature of teaching, Derbolav expresses two essentials or characteristics regarding this nature of teaching. The first characteristic of the course of teaching which follows the organized elemental which the pupil him/herself learns from the encounter is the "spirit" of the direction of the science, if he/she remains responsive. The second essential is that a child, with an elemental unlocked, at least has in hand the key to a larger

learning world. This is a view also held by Spranger. With this key (insight), a child can open locked contents until, for him/her, "the obvious and yet unfathomable contents become transparent" (4, 39).

Thus, there are two *fundamentalia* which are indicated by Derbolav; the first is the spirit or ethos of the contents of science, which also address a child in his/her being human, as well as the insights which are acquired and become keys for him/her in his/her future involvement with reality. The second fundamental is "transmitted" to a child by unlocking the elementals which function propaedeutically.

Derbolav further expands on these themes by saying that the first propaedeutic characteristic proceeds to the second. If a child is first able to make the "spirit" of the content area in question his/her own, his/her independent unlocking can proceed more meaningfully, because it occurs following the valid principles of this content area.

Derbolav's view of the elemental, as the possibility of applying a variety of forms of representing contents, is a valid interpretation of it. It is precisely because of the rich variety of forms of representation that the elementals offer which makes it so necessary to make a study of them for successful teaching.

Unlocking elementals (exemplary teaching), for Derbolav, is always foundational--it is the foundation of the scientific structure which is unlocked, and it is the foundation for a child's becoming, and his/her possibility to work and investigate independently, in connection with the unlocking of an exemplar or elemental (4, 33).

2.10 Eduard Spranger

Two penetrating questions provide input for Spranger's discussion of the problem of learning contents, i.e.,

- (a) "How can I intervene formatively? and
- (b) "How can I find suitable and pliable formative material in terms of which I can educate?"

His own response is that general cultural materials assume the character of formative material in the hands of a born educator.

However, this occurs nowhere in a learning event without reducing the contents (to their essentials).

Effective teaching cannot occur without the fruitful unlocking of elementals. It is the unlocker's task to "elementalize the gems of meaning" of the science (contents).

Derbolav's comment about Spranger's view of the elemental also suggests the fundamental. He says that, for Spranger, the elemental is not only foundational for the whole, but simultaneously, is an unlocking for "other, additional cases". If an unlocking for a pupil is also an unlocking for "other and additional" cases, this means that, through such unlocking, the pupil has gained fundamental intellectual equipment.

The path from the elemental to the fundamental is an open book for Spranger. At the end of such an unlocking, he says, a silent "aha" must arise, i.e., a lived experience by a child that something opened or had opened for him/her. In his discussion of the fruitful moment (4, 136), he also refers to the work of F. Copei.

Spranger's contribution to the problem area of the elemental and the fundamental is significant, as is his contribution to the didactic and pedagogical. He views the born teacher as one who allows for the bewildering overload of learning contents, and who is equipped to reduce the contents and present them such that a learner can assimilate, master, and make them his/her own. The teacher must take note of the level of becoming of the child for whom he/she unlocks the contents.

Finally, Spranger indicates that, from a good unlocking, a moment of clarity appears for the learner which, as does a ray of light, brightens his/her path by investigating "structurally related things". Spranger's view that successful unlocking reveals fundamental phenomena which enlighten structurally related things, can be compared, with interest, to Landman's description of a category, as a means of illuminative thinking (22, 4). For a child, reality is unlocked categorically, and such an unlocking equips him/her with categories to explore and meaningfully unlock things for him/herself with the light (category) which has been "turned on" for him/her. According to Spranger, with this light, which has been turned on for him/her by the unlocking, a child can scientifically investigate structures (contents).

For Spranger, authentic *didaskhein* (teaching) cuts deeper than a technique or skill for unlocking knowledge. In the hand of a born educator, it is the "art of breaking open the bread of life for a child" (4, 136). More than a skill is required to see into and enlighten elementals and their relationships by means of unlocking them "to intervening in the souls of children".

2.11 Erich Weniger

According to Weniger, methods in didactic practice are only forms of human encounter. The contents in terms of which there is teaching spring from different subject sciences, and must be presented to a child being taught so he/she "experiences something as easy". It goes against Weniger's grain when a child, who must be taught and educated, is entirely overlooked by the choice of elemental contents, which overemphasizes the subject science.

Weniger does not talk of didactic materialism, but of didactic objectivism. With this, he means that the subject determines not only the contents, but that the methods used in the act of unlocking are also derived from the subject. In this way, the teacher's unlocking actions, the child's becoming, and the situation itself are subject to the methods prescribed by the nature of the subject or science.

Weniger criticizes those who establish a teaching practice where the stated aim is a "scientific" aim, the methods are described as the "scientific" method, and forming is then "scientific" forming. By following this line, the scientific structure is reduced to the didactic structure, and the scientific to the didactic.

It follows that Weniger favorably views didactic practice by those persons who command the contents of the subject sciences, and who also are didactically schooled. The teaching must not only be focused on broadening and deepening knowledge, but a child must be led to taking actual positions with respect to the problems of the times. Hence, through teaching, a child must be led to live a meaningful life.

The teacher's task is to unlock what is necessary for a child to fulfill life demands. Contents must be represented, i.e., figure as elementals. The teacher must "represent what to a child is

unlimited", so he/she can "experience it as easy". The last quotation refers to an elemental as well as a fundamental and, simultaneously, to an elemental-fundamental path. A child must lived experience simplified contents. This refers to reduced contents, which must be unlocked, but also lived experienced by a child so that gradually and progressively he/she becomes better equipped to live his/her life meaningfully.

The act of reduction must be carried out so that an event in history is now important to a child. Thus, the elemental must function in concrete time, and make time concrete.

The formative work of the didactic activity must push through to where the power in a child is developed so that he/she can purposefully advance toward mastering the future demands of life. Forming makes a person free because, by means of teaching, a child acquires ample power, and he/she becomes equipped for the demands of life. Weniger uses the phrase "the other function of forming". This refers to the fact that one function is the unlocking of contents, and which has cognitive insight as its aim, while "the other function of forming" refers to insights and "powers" which equip a child to live his/her life meaningfully (57, parts 1 and 2).

For Weniger, teaching also is propaedeutic in nature and, thus, all unlocking of elementals contribute to a child's preparation for life. This is a view also advocated by Spranger.

For Weniger, there is no separation between a teaching aim and an educative aim. As far as he is concerned, to actualize educative teaching, the didactician is required to consciously think about those contents which have formative value. He/she must reflect on those contents, and "forms of ripening," which bring about a spiritual "ripening" and opening up, which prepare a child for the complex experiences of living, and for being accountable for life.

The parents and teachers are great mediators in this world, because they stand between the child and lifeworld contents. They do not stand there in isolation but are entwined with the contents for the child. The parent and adult who enter a child's life horizon, at the same time, are the most important parts of his/her world. In the first place, they also are life contents and, thus, must unlock or open themselves to the child and be accessible. It is from this didactic insight that the adult must bring the child close to him/her to

establish and bring about a formative encounter in which the child is an active participant. A child acquires his/her forming from his/her spiritual involvement with the adult.

Another of Weniger's insights raised here is his view of a child's (a person's) personality. For him, personality is not the fundamental product of the formative moments but is the fruit of a difficultly lived life. Here, the child's intentional going out to the world and reality arise. He/she becomes a personality, not because of the elemental unlockings which have had a fundamental impact on him/her, but by how he/she lives his/her life with reference to the *fundamentalia* which, from the course of teaching, have enriched him/her. For Weniger, personality arises by functionalizing the fundamentals--something which each child must do him/herself before he/she can reap their full benefits.

2.12 Wolfgang Klafki

The problem of the elemental and the fundamental is fully treated and reinterpreted by Klafki in his comprehensive work, **Das pädagogische Problem des Elementaren und die Theorie der kategorialen Bildung** ("The pedagogical problem of the elemental, and the theory of categorical forming"). It is mainly in terms of Klafki's pronouncements that the problem of this study is developed, and this is shown by the many references to him.

Klafki indicates that there are a variety of ways the fundamental and the elemental can appear. In each case of a fundamental, it has the character of a foundational experience or lived experience. Some formative contents are not only accessible in experiencing and lived experiencing--they do not exist outside experiencing and lived experiencing (16, 442; 4, 158). Then, Klafki proceeds to describe the elemental in its different forms of appearing, i.e., the exemplary, the typical, the classical, the representative, the simple form, the simple aim form, the simple esthetic form.

For Klafki, the elemental is the only form in which the contents can appear in a teaching situation for them to be FORMATIVE CONTENTS. It is the only way contents can have FORMATIVE VALUE. And, specifically, he says fruitful moments, the fundamentals appear and fundamentally address the child as a being who is becoming. Without a child lived experiencing the

worthiness of the fundamentals, a teaching activity cannot be formative.

The elemental embodies contents which can be unlocked for a child. It refers to a relationship of the formative content to the reality represented in the elemental. Only because the formative contents figure as relatively simple can they unlock the formative reality spiritually for a child by means of a didactician's guidance. The foundational experience or lived experience of contents and unlocked elementals are described as fundamentals or *fundamentalia*.

Along with the theory of the elemental and the fundamental, Klafki advances his theory of categorical forming, which amounts to a double unlocking in the didactic situation leading to forming. This is considered in a later chapter.

Spiritual appropriation and control are only possible by means of the concrete. For forming, this involves making certain fundamental categories living, spiritual possessions of the becoming child. This occurs by unlocking the concrete, the single case, the historical. But, the child recognizes the non-concrete and non-individual case in each of the examples (16, 388).

Klafki explains the various levels of the problems of the elemental and the fundamental. This doesn't bring the passage from the elemental to the fundamental clearly to the fore. It seems as if he puts the elemental, as a concrete-temporal form of appearance, in a separate framework.

2.13 Julius Drechsler

Drechsler maintains a purely anthropological point of departure, which gives rise to clear and worthwhile pronouncements about didactic pedagogics.

He places language before all other subjects because, viewed anthropologically, it embodies an authentic way of being in the world (6, 73-74). He sees language as elemental and fundamental. It is by means of language that concepts are made child-accessible, and by which elementals are unlocked. However, Drechsler does not fall into the didactically questionable view of R. Meisters that language and subject terminology must be clarified beforehand.

Lang+uage is an elemental, insofar as it is a medium for unlocking contents.

Didactic unlocking leads to learning effects and to a child taking fundamental positions. For a child, language is a fundamental necessity for aiding his/her verbalizing or understanding of the changing positions he/she takes. Without language, there cannot be a meaningful interpretation of the world and reality. In this respect, language also is a fundamental.

Didactic discussion of forming, and of didactic theory and practice should always place forming above teaching (6, 38-39). In teaching, reality (as content) becomes known, while in forming, the world is unlocked for a child. The fundamental moves a child to a comprehensive view of reality and world. (The concept world refers to a world already acquired and assimilated, and to which a child continually directs him/herself).

In a didactic sense, forming is characterized by contents which make reality discernible such that, from this reality, a world can be continually created (established) by a pupil. There are gradations in the intensity of a child's involvement with the contents. Only from adequate contents (adequate unlocking) does a child acquire a true view of him/herself and reality.

Drechsler follows Klafki in his view of the double-sided unlocking of categorical forming. In both cases, it must be understood that an adult who unlocks is a precondition for all formative and categorical unlocking (6, 60).

The social pedagogic aspect of the didactic situation is seen by Drechsler as a path to a child's fundamental being-with others (Mitsein) as a result or effect of his/her active dealings with a co-being who has entered his/her life horizon in the situation.

Drechsler is the person who showed that the primitive stem of the word "onderrig" (instruction) is "inter-rig" (directing among). He then interprets this as that direction which does not allow a child to remain where he/she finds him/herself but directs him/her to what he/she can become or ought to be.

The adult directs a child with contents, and, in this way, he/she is gradually led to adulthood and responsibility. However, instructing

(inter-rig) also implies a reciprocal direction, which amounts to the teacher (adult) also being touched by entering this directing encounter. Three moments are preconditions for establishing a didactic (teaching, instructing) situation, i.e., the adult, the child, and the contents of reality. Instructing, as an unlocking "reciprocal direction", necessarily requires all three of these moments.

Regarding the elemental and the fundamental, Drechsler follows Klafki's pronouncement (6, 61-62). The fundamental only appears when the elemental is worked through to it--a direction of thinking followed in this study. The elemental must be thought about in close connection with unlocking contents and the theory of categorical forming, while the fundamental embraces the entire pedagogic event of the moral educative. The question is asked, to what extent the fundamental can be reached from the didactic. Drechsler cites Klafki who, in his turn, brings forward the contributions of several authors who indicate how there can be a passage from the elemental to the fundamental. The fundamental has an existential-spiritual character, while the elemental possesses an unlocking and introducing character.

2.14 Friedrich Copei

In didactic thought, Copei is known as the person who has thought about and described the "fruitful moment" in the act of unlocking. Contents, which are reduced to elementals, must be presented to a child in such a way that he/she can uncover their essentials him/herself. An insight must arise, which is known as the "aha experience" in the psychology of thinking, and which Copei describes as that fruitful moment when a child him/herself experiences and lived experiences.

Copei highly values a pupil's questions and questioning attitude. It is necessary that a questioning attitude arise in a child which, in its unfolding, eventually leads him/her to acquire insights into contents of reality.

This fruitful moment is not a process which can be repeated with any regularity or lawfully but must be seen as the fruit of hard didactic work and effort.

The pupil not only acquires insight into contents but also acquires methods of inquiry, which become fundamental methods for

his/her future interpretations of the world, or his/her own involvement with things. Copei says this method forming must be viewed as an integral part of categorical forming.

Klafki concludes his discussion of Copei's contributions to the pedagogical by saying, "In fruitful moments, subject and object, mind and world fuse". From this, an obvious deduction is made, i.e., teaching and educating are actualized in one and the same action.

For Drechsler, the matter of a fruitful moment in unlocking refers to the *maieutic*, which first appeared in the works of Socrates, i.e., that all learning and all teaching must penetrate to those essential cores from which a person's authentic existence ("Sein") is formed (6, 104). Consequently, teaching does not mean the "transfer" of knowledge, but the preparation for a fruitful moment. This means the teacher must concentrate on the pupil assimilating an animated (lively) readiness (eagerness) to try, in his/her wrestling with things (contents), to disclose their meaning.

For Copei, the course of a lesson and of teaching, which is constructed step-by-step, is unacceptable. He asserts that such a fixed, systematic course is detrimental to a child. This forces a child to hold him/herself to the logical and strictly matter of fact, and there is no path to a fundamental, which directs him/her to the larger structure of reality; again, this confirms the advantage of understanding, anticipating, and transcending. In this, there is a very clear difference between a binding and enslaving methodology, and an unlocking, liberating didactics, i.e., a dominating, binding, constraining methodology, in contrast to a freedom-giving, personal mastery of contents.

The ideal to strive for is an introduction to an elemental unlocking, by which a child, in a fruitful moment, is addressed in a fundamental way, which is a precondition for general forming to occur (6, 102).

2.15 Leonhard Lahrman

In 1972, a work by Lahrman was published with the title, "Phantasie und Elementares Lernen" (Fantasy and learning elementals), which makes a special contribution to our insights into a child becoming (adult) and the didactic. He states that a child is

as much a fantasy- as a knowing-being, and that didactic activity must make provision so that a child, as a fantasizing being, is done justice (19, 8). This statement is made with reference to Gehlen.

In a didactic situation, both the things (contents) and the child change. The child changes the contents to contents-for-him/her. Lahrman cites Nietzsche, who says, "To learn is to change". The adult is him/herself not aware of the nature of the changes which occur in a child, but he/she knows that this "making the contents his/her own" is always unique. Therefore, essentially, learning is not predictable, exact, and organizable. Even so, with acquired insights into teaching and learning, a practice must be established which is directed to forming so that, for lack of all insights regarding teaching and learning, one is not completely off base in establishing a course (of teaching/learning), which meets the needs of the pupils (19, 69).

For Lahrman, fantasy functions as the ground for each human activity, therefore, also for learning. He also says learning and experiencing are closely linked in their meaning. On the one hand, learning precedes experiencing but, in other respects, it builds on experiences (19, 74). He agrees with Kant in saying that experiencing gives us our first knowledge of reality. Hegel also believes that experiencing is the beginning of learning, but then the child also must be there him/herself, even if only by means of his/her senses but, better yet, if with his/her deepest spirit, with his/her essential self-awareness.

Then, Lahrman asks, to what degree a child's fantasy develops, and to what degree a child experiences things him/herself without the help of others. As with anyone, everything a child experiences is linked to other experience, and to what he/she must acquire. Learning never starts from zero because there are always experiences which have preceded the learning. There is experiencing, as acquiring, but there also is experiencing which is congealed. Remembering and memory are only possible through the work of fantasy.

As far as the elemental and the fundamental are concerned, Lahrman says the following about them (19, 100): The concept elemental, just as the concepts exemplary and the fundamental, has acquired great significance in the didactic pronouncements of our

time. He refers to Gunter Slotta and Klafki in summarizing the elemental with five ideas:

1. The possibility that the general can be included in something specific;
2. The transfer effect of these general things;
3. Its double function, i.e., that it unlocks reality for a child *and* unlocks a child for reality;
4. The extension of the elemental into the question-loaded, meaning-imbued reality;
5. The connectedness of the elemental to the means to self-activity.

Therefore, for Lahrman, the elemental is pedagogically relevant, but he insists that, in addition to the elemental, there is information and knowledge which cannot be left out of consideration. In this respect, he cites Roth, who places the concepts elemental and exemplary opposite orientation and information, but he recognizes that the elemental goes deeper than mere orientational learning.

Lahrman asks for a fundamental path on which a child's fantasy directs him/her and, thus, allows him/her to be a genuine person. The elemental unlocking also must be directed to stimulate, foster, and strengthen child being in the world, as fantasy. He clearly indicates that a rational, general human fantasy is proposed as a condition for establishing all human relationships (19, 144).